**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**
**Patent and Trademark Office**
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 08/942,264 | 10/01/97 | BOUCHER G | E-679 |

LM02/0607

ROBERT E MEYER
PITNEY BOWES INC INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
AND TECHNOLOGY LAW DEPARTMENT
35 WATERVIEW DRIVE PO BOX 3000
SHELTON CT 06484

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| PARDO, T | |
| **ART UNIT** | **PAPER NUMBER** |
| 2771 | 11 |

**DATE MAILED:** 06/07/00

**Pleas find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or pr ceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

| Office Action Summary | Application No. 08/942,264 | Applicant(s) Boucher et al. |
|---|---|---|
| | Examiner Thuy Pardo | Group Art Unit 2771 |

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Apr 4, 1900* .

☐ This action is **FINAL.**

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire *3* month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

**Disposition of Claims**

☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐approved ☐disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____ .

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____ .

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

**Attachment(s)**

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). *07*

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

*--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---*

1. Applicant's Amendment filed on April 04, 2000 in response to Examiner's Office Action has been reviewed. Claims 9-10 have been added.

2. In regard to Applicant's Amendment sent by facsimile on April 04, 2000 as a substitute to the missing Amendment filed on November 02, 1999, it is noted that the Application Serial Number on the Amendment was 08/837,829 instead of 08/942,264. The Application Serial no. 08/837,829 has been already a patent no. 5,978,564.

3. Claims 1-10 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over **Carroll et al.** (Carroll) patent no. 5,293,310, in view of **Owens et al.** (Owens) patent no. 6,047,267.

6. As to claim 6, Carroll teaches the invention substantially as claimed, comprising:

(a) a client data processing system [10 of fig 1; fig. 6];

(b) a host data processing system [12 of fig. 1; 30 of fig. 6];

(c ) a data access system for storing and managing files [data center 14 of fig.1; col. 7, lines 2-18, 47-62, storing and managing a plurality of files, fig. 3-5];

(d) communication means for linking the client data processing system with the host data processing system [see the communication link between the carrier 1 and the user 1 through data center 14 of fig. 1].

(e) first memory means for storing the plurality of files [customized configuration database, 42 of fig. 9; col. 10, lines 26-50] and second memory means for predetermined set of files [discounts database and surcharges database, 44 and 46 of fig. 9; col. 10, lines 26-50].

Carroll does not explicitly teach updating a set of object tables at the host data processing system. However, Owens teaches mapping data according to an object-oriented scheme to data in persistent memory according to a relational database scheme so that the object-oriented scheme generated by a user may be efficiently stored and search in persistent memory [ab; fig. 6; col. 2, lines 42-43]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art to add the object-oriented database of Owens to the data processing system of Carroll because it would be easier to query, modify and write information to object-oriented databases. Furthermore, it would save time and memory resource within the host system.

7. As to claim 1, Carroll teaches the invention substantially as claimed, comprising the steps of:

(a) initiating a communication link between the client data processing system and the host data processing system [a communication link between users 10 and data center 14, col. 5, lines 20-32];

(b) uploading a set of data from the client data processing system to the host data processing system [col. 6, lines 57-59];

(c ) reading the set of data at the host data processing system [read input file, 210 of fig. 13; col. 6, lines 65-68];

(d) determining which data set is to be updated [load update 220 of fig. 13] and further determining which data is to be maintained [reject update 224 of fig. 13];

(e) constructing a new set of data from the host data processing system to the client data processing system [222 of fig. 13];

(f) transmitting the new set of data from the host data processing system to the client data processing system [update format to be sent to the user station 10, col. 7, lines 2-24];

(g) verifying accurate receipt of the new set of data at the client data processing system [check to ensure the update information, col. 7, lines 21-24]; and

(h) restarting the client data processing system [user 10 will load the update information into the system, col. 7, lines 19-21].

Carroll does not explicitly teach updating a set of object tables at the host data processing system. However, Owens teaches mapping data according to an object-oriented scheme to data in persistent memory according to a relational database scheme so that the object-oriented scheme generated by a user may be efficiently stored and search in persistent memory [ab; fig. 6; col. 2, lines

42-43]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art to add the object-oriented database of Owens into the data processing system of Carroll because it would be easier to query, modify and write information to object-oriented databases. Furthermore, it would save time and memory resource within the host system.

8. As to claim 4, Carroll and Owens teach the invention substantially as claimed. Carroll further teaches LAN comprising a plurality of nodes, wherein each node is linked to at least one other node within the LAN and data is exchanged between each node and at least one other node [a plurality of carrier nodes and user nodes, fig. 1].

9. As to claim 2, Carroll and Owens teach the invention substantially as claimed. Carroll further teaches (a) saving a data map of a new set of data at host data processing system [420 and 422 of fig. 16; col. 17, lines 35-38];

(b) receiving and saving the new set of data within a memory of the client data processing system [col. 7, lines 19-21]; and

(d) comparing the second data map with the first data map [compare data entered through an input device with information stored in memory, ab], and if the first data map and the second data map do not match, then nullifying the verification [col. 7, lines 21-30].

Carroll does not explicitly teach retransmitting the new set of data as a second data map back to the host data processing system. However, this feature is well known in the art. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art to put this feature into the system in order to continue to update the new set of object tables within the data access system.

10. As to claim 3, Carroll and Owens teach the invention substantially as claimed, with the exception of the communication link initiated by requesting the link through a modem. However, this feature is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art to apply this feature into the system in order to enable transmitting the information from the carrier in digital form to the computer.

11. As to claim 5, Carroll and Owens teach the invention substantially as claimed, with the exception of the communication link activated within a set of protocols common to the communication net. However, this feature is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art to apply this feature into the system because a set of rules standard designed (protocols) would enable computers to connect with one another and to exchange information with as little error as possible.

12. As to claims 7-8 and 9-10, Carroll and Owens teach the invention substantially as claimed, with the exception of the DAS collocated with the client data processing system or the host data processing system. However, this is a matter of designed choices. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art to design the DAS collocated with the client data

processing system or the host data processing system because it would suit the client or host systems' convenience and save processing time of updating data objects.

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

14. Further references of interest are cited on Form PTO-892 which is an attachment to this office action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy Pardo, whose telephone number is (703) 305-1091. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas G. Black, can be reached at (703) 305-9707. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-9731.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

16. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

**Or:**

(703) 308-5359, (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Thuy Pardo
June 02, 2000

WAYNE AMSBURY
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER